

ABSTRACT

[illegible]

G.O.RT.No. 135

Read the following:

- ***

In the ref. 1st read above, departmental proceedings have been initiated against Sri Muvva Ramalingam, the then DEO, Guntur, under rule 20 of APCS (CCA) Rules, 1991, for violation of rule (3) and rule 9(7) of APCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964.

3. In the ref. 3rd read above, Dr. Premchand, IAS (Rtd), COI has been appointed as Inquiring Authority to inquire into the charges framed against Sri M. Ramalingam, the then DEO, Guntur.

5. In the ref. 5th read above, the COI has submitted the enquiry report. The Inquiring Authority has stated that the Charge-I(1) i.e. neither signed nor mentioned the duty details for the months August, 2007 to November, 2007 in the Attendance Register maintained in the o/o District Educational Officer, Guntur framed against charged officer is held as partly proved. The Charge-I(2) i.e. did not submit Annual Property Returns during his entire service except during the year 2003-04 framed against Charged Officer is held as not proved.

.....2

7. In his representation vide ref. 7th read above, Sri M. Ramalingam has stated that the Inquiring Authority has concluded that the charge 1 is not proved in spirit and charge 2 is not held proved. Regarding charge-1 the IA stated that there was no denying the fact that the CO had indeed performed his functions as expected of him, as proved from Ex. D2 and D3 (tour dairy). During the examination of witness, the prosecution tried to invoke District Educational Office Manual to say that officer should record his attendance every day or mention about his tours when he attends the office. Therefore, it is conclusively proved that the CO has failed to sign in the register about his duty or attendance. However, he has also categorically proved that he was neither absconding from duties, nor did he neglect his office duties. His tour diary and meeting attendance certificates prove that he has indeed attended his duties as expected of him. Therefore, the charge though proved as per the letter, it is not proved as per spirit and the DA should take this fact into account. It is only a minor deviation from the norm and not a major misconduct. Therefore, Sri M. Ramalingam has requested to drop further action against him as the COI held that charge 1 is not held proved as per spirit and charge 2 is not proved.

8. After careful examination of the report of the COI and further representation of the Charged Officer, it has been decided to drop further action against Sri M. Ramalingam, the then DEO, Guntur, as it was purely a procedural lapse.

9. Accordingly, Govt. hereby drop further action against Sri M. Ramalingam, the then DEO, Guntur, on the charges framed vide ref. 1st read above.

10. The Director of School Education shall take necessary further action accordingly.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

B. RAJSEKHAR
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVT.

To
The Director of School Education, AP, Vijayawada.
The individual through the DSE, AP, Vijayawada.

// FORWARDED BY ORDER //

SECTION OFFICER